



Police end "the completely unnecessary occupation of Senate Chamber forced by small group of students"

The following statement concerning events surrounding the occupation of the Senate Chamber, Simcoe Hall, on Friday evening and its restoration to normal use by University of Toronto police and Metropolitan Toronto police Sunday morning has been issued by the Acting President, Dr. John H. Sword:

On Friday evening, March 10, the Senate of the University met to consider a report of a sub-committee of the Library Council (the Heyworth committee) concerning the need for and degree of access to the new John P. Robarts Library. The Heyworth committee report has been endorsed by the Library Council, which is composed of faculty, students and administrators.

While the Senate meeting was in progress in the Medical Sciences Building, a small number of students occupied the Senate chamber in Simcoe Hall. Following the Senate meeting they were joined by a number of other students and non-students who gained forcible entry into the Hall. Approximately 75 students and others were involved, which was the maximum number at any one time, and far fewer during most of the occupation.

Following the "occupation", an ad hoc group of senior administrators and academics met for most of Friday night and all of Saturday morning with a group of students to discuss the situation and to see if a way could be found to end the sit-in. It proved difficult to negotiate. On the one hand, the composition of the student group changed constantly and no continuing link appeared to exist between the negotiating team and the official representatives of the graduate and undergraduate student bodies. On the other hand, the ad hoc group of senior administrators and academics had no constitutional authority to negotiate the issues being raised by the student group, since nearly all the questions relating to the need for and degree of access are still under discussion in the University body responsible for making a final decision, which is the Senate.

On Friday evening the Senate approved in principle that there will be different degrees of access to the Robarts Library stacks by different users. The Senate is not, as has been alleged, a statement opposing the desirability of unlimited access to the Robarts Library. A majority of members of the Senate indicated that they had doubts about the practicability of unlimited access to all resources by all users.

At no time was there any intention to deny access to the Library's resources to any members of the public, students, faculty, and administrative staff. This has been misrepresented constantly. The issue has been what regulations will be necessary, and how they are to be implemented, so that the needs of users can be most fully met. The major issue is what degree of direct access to the stacks of the new Library can be provided in order to serve all users effectively. The substance of the Heyworth Report dealing with the need for and degree of access is still to be discussed by the Senate and the Senate has agreed to meet in special session as soon as possible for this purpose.

The University cannot condone the seizure of buildings carried out in order to impose solutions on matters under consideration by responsible bodies. In spite of this the University authorities met late into Saturday morning and during the day on Saturday and varying groups of student leaders and those sitting-in in order to negotiate a volun-



This was the scene in the Senate Chamber as sit-in began on Friday evening

tary end to the sit-in. It became clear to us that the hard-core group of students and non-students involved would not withdraw unless the President undertook to guarantee the decisions demanded by a few dozen students and non-students who had seized the Senate chamber. They indicated their intention to continue the occupation until the Senate met their demands, a process that would have prevented normal

operation of the chief administrative building. We were also concerned that further occupation might extend beyond the Senate chamber. At the beginning of the occupation entry to a major office in Simcoe Hall was forced. Entry to another office was effected later on Saturday during the occupation.

The occupation was completely unnecessary and was forced by a very small group of students interested in

polarization, confrontation, and the imposition of their views. The vast majority of the University community is agreed that there be maximum feasible use by all groups, including the public, of the Library's resources. The only matter at issue – and is still being discussed in the University Senate – is the operational method to assure that the needs of all individuals and groups are most effectively served.

The events from Friday to Sunday

The Senate on Friday evening adopted a motion that "the Senate approves in principle that there will be different degrees of access to the John P. Robarts Research Library stacks by different users."

The Senate Chamber was crowded,

with people standing in the aisle and others in the corridor leading to its single entrance, at 8.15 p.m., the normal starting time. Because of the crush – approximately 250 in a room which the Fire Marshal insists should not have more than 75 – William Kent, the Act-

ing Secretary, moved the meeting to a large third floor lecture room in the Medical Sciences Building where proceedings got under way, with Acting President J. H. Sword in the chair, at about 8.35 p.m. About a dozen students stayed in the Senate Chamber ("to direct late-comers to the new location", a student said later).

Dr. Sword obtained Senate's agreement to discuss a special recommendation of the executive committee related to the Heyworth committee report and then departed from customary procedure by asking four students, none a member of Senate, to introduce the subject with short statements. The first speaker, Craig Heron, said any restrictions on access to the stacks were a defence of elitist privilege within the University and were elitist in relation to the public. Garry Neil, the second speaker, said unlimited access by all had been endorsed by a vote of 8,500 to 63 in a University "plebiscite" and by letters from student councils and associations in all Ontario universities, by trade unions, and other groups. Anthony Leah argued that unlimited access could not be denied to the public because of the way public funds had been used for building and will be used for its upkeep. Michael Kaufman said the Heyworth committee should have put its emphasis on community needs rather than on research which "is directed towards maintaining the corrupt and decadent status quo".

One Senate member who opposed the motion said the University should put the ball in the Government's court by

(See page 2, col. 1)

18 charges are laid by police

As University of Toronto and Metropolitan Toronto police approached the Senate Chamber in Simcoe Hall between 10.30 and 11 a.m. on Sunday morning, the doors – which open inward – were hurriedly closed and barricaded with a heavy table and other furniture. Efforts to force the doors loosened a panel in one of them and it was through this aperture that police entered. Eighteen were arrested.

Seven others who were camped in the anteroom to the Office of the Executive Vice-President (Non-Academic) left the building without incident.

Metropolitan Toronto Police, Division 52, have issued the following list of those charged. All have been released, to appear in court March 27.

THOMAS McLAUGHLIN, 24, student, charged with trespass and obstructing police.

WILLIAM F. GHETTY, 25, student, charged with trespass and assaulting police.

MARK GOLDBLEET, 19, student, charged with trespass and assault.

HARVEY E. PINDER, 20, student, charged with trespass.

HAROLD F. LAVENDER, 21, student, charged with trespass.

MICHAEL S. STEINBERG, 20, student, charged with trespass.

RANDY RUTH REYNOLDS, 19, dental clerk, charged with assault and trespass.

SANTIO CIALLELLA, student, charged with trespass.

THOMAS L. WALKOM, 21, Editor of *The Varsity*, charged with trespass.

ROBERT GEORGE BETTSON, student, charged with trespass.

IAN JOLL, 16, reporter, charged with trespass.

PHILIP CHARLES HERBERT, 20, charged with trespass.

DANIEL COLE EVERET, engineer, charged with trespass.

HOWARD STEIN, 19, unemployed, charged with trespass.

ROBERT H. STOREY, unemployed, charged with trespass.

MARY ALICE TATE, 19, student, charged with trespass.

ANTHONY D. LEAH, 22, student, charged with trespass.

ROBERT SPENCER, 23, President of SAC, charged with trespass.

The sit-in Friday to Sunday

(Continued from page 1)

accepting a policy of unlimited access to all and demanding the funds to implement it. Another — a professor — said that, as a freshman exploring the stacks, he had encountered the subject around which he had built his career.

Dean A. E. Safarian commented that unlimited access would be the most desirable situation — but that until the demand on the stacks was known, there was real danger that people with greater needs than others would be unable to meet them. He felt that, by experimenting, it would be possible to work out a system that would ensure the greatest possible use.

Prof. Bernard Etkin pointed out that charging the public a fee for borrowing privileges could not be called discrimination: students pay for library privileges through their fees.

Dean E. A. Robinson felt that the Heyworth committee should have reported on all University of Toronto libraries, including the library at his college (Erindale).

After further debate, the chairman heeded a call to put the motion. When the result of the vote was announced student members of the audience departed, one of them announcing that they would discuss their course of action, and the Senate turned to other business. At 10:30 there was a motion to adjourn. Dr. Sword took the view that half an hour could be profitably employed in beginning an item by item study of the Heyworth report. The Senate supported him, and had indicated its approval for a special meeting that would be devoted to this one subject when proceedings were interrupted by SAC President Robert Spencer. Mr. Spencer told Dr. Sword he was urgently needed at Simcoe Hall where University police were resisting efforts by students to enter the building and the front door was in danger of being torn from its hinges. Dr. Sword adjourned the meeting and left immediately, accompanied by several senior members of Senate.

When Dr. Sword reached Simcoe Hall he found the front door intact. The students who trooped over from the Senate meeting had found it easier to force entry through one of the rear doors and had joined the dozen students who were awaiting developments in the Senate Chamber. A convenient entrance-exit was quickly arranged by propping open and manning a fire-door leading to Galbraith Road. At first, the relatively small force of safety and security officers persuaded the students to restrict themselves to the Senate Chamber and the wide corridor leading from the Chamber to the fire escape.

There were about 60 students in the building for the first hour. The number fluctuated from then on. (The presence of a photographer who asked to take pictures was approved by a vote of 36 to 22.) About 20 or 25 slept in the Senate Chamber Friday night.

After satisfying himself that the situation was stable for the moment, Dr. Sword met with a group of senior colleagues in the Dean's conference room of the Medical Sciences Building. Shortly after they began their discussions about how the problem might be resolved they were joined by W. B. Harris, Chairman of the Board of Governors. Mr. Harris remained a member of this group throughout the weekend.

The first exchange of views with students came before midnight Friday. The student party included Mr. Neil and Mr. Kaufman — two of the four speakers who had opened the Senate discussion — and three members of SAC: President Spencer, Brian Morgan and Frank Nacsa.

An hour later Mr. Spencer and Mr. Kaufman visited the Senate Chamber. They came back to state that their report on the conversations with Dr. Sword and his advisers had aroused little interest. Shortly afterwards Anthony Leah and Miss Mary Tate arrived at the Medical Sciences Building. They said they had been appointed to a steering committee by the students who were sitting in, but were not authorized to make statements on their behalf because

there had been no time to review their position. Dr. Sword declared a recess during which the students who were present retired to the Medical Sciences cafeteria.

On returning to the conference room, Miss Tate said she had nothing to say at that time beyond requesting that the front doors of Simcoe Hall be opened to provide students with easier access to the building. It would, she said, show "good faith". Dr. Sword asked what evidence of good faith the students were willing to offer in return. Miss Tate suggested none.

Dr. Sword and his colleagues had another session on Saturday morning with the students' negotiation team. At this meeting Miss Tate and Mr. Leah were joined by Mr. Nacsa and, for a brief time, by Christopher Huxley.

When the meeting ended for a lunch break, Dr. Sword's group made it clear that any views the students had to communicate would be received and that the Acting President and his colleagues would continue to be available for that purpose. Dr. Sword and the others spent the afternoon awaiting word, but none came until the next day.

Early on Sunday morning Dr. Sword received at his home this letter dated March 11 and headed, "Senate Chambers, Simcoe Hall, University of Toronto":

"As the members of the negotiating committee elected by a general meeting of the students and members of the public occupying the Senate Chamber of Simcoe Hall, we wish to communicate the following resolutions passed by the general meeting of the evening of March 11:

"The occupants of Simcoe Hall demand of the University Administration written public assurance that the following demands will be met:

"(1) that the stacks of the "Robarts" library be open to all students, staff, faculty, and members of the public

"(2) that there must be no differentiation in access to stacks or resources of the new research library. This means that whatever regulations be established, they be applied equally to all students, staff, faculty, and members of the public. In particular, we demand the abolition of readership fees (now \$50).

"(3) that Acting President Sword respond to these demands at the beginning of a general student meeting to be called on the afternoon of Monday, March 13th at 1:00 p.m. in the Senate Chamber.

"As members of the negotiating committee we are available to discuss these demands at any time, provided reasonable notice be given. We can be contacted at the Senate Chamber."

The letter bore the signatures "Tony Leah, Chris Huxley, Katherine Wood, Mary Tate", who, it was stated, "signed on behalf of Ernie Hobbs, Chris Huxley, Darlene Lawson, Tony Leah, Bob Spencer, Mary Tate, Katherine Wood." There was a note at the bottom indicating that copies were being sent to The Varsity, the Toronto Star, the Globe and Mail, The Canadian Press, and the Canadian University Press.

Blue Cross plan open for semi-private room

Staff members who wish to prepay the additional cost of semi-private hospital accommodation may join the Blue Cross supplemental plan providing they apply to the Staff Relations Section, Personnel Department, before March 31. The premium must be prepaid three months, with the first payroll deduction taking place in April, with coverage effective July 1.

The monthly rates are \$1 (single) and \$2 (family).

Those who do not join this plan now will not have another opportunity until September for coverage effective Jan. 1, 1973.

For details contact 928-2015.

COMING EVENTS

MARCH

14 TUESDAY

Lecture
Drama

"The Dramatic Triple Play: Actor to Audience; Audience to Actor; Audience to Audience". Jo Mielziner. Hart House Theatre. 4.30 p.m. Free (Drama Centre)

Meeting
Medicine

"The Effect of Increased Intracranial Pressure on the Brain's Energy, Metabolism and Mitochondrial Function" and "Regional Cerebral Blood Flow and Intracranial Pressure in Comatose Patients". Dr. Hart Schutz, R. Samuel McLaughlin Travelling Fellow, H. A. Beatty Scholar. 5 p.m. Business meeting of Toronto Neurological Society and Institute Of Neurology at 6 p.m. Election of Officers.

Seminars
Medicine

"Studies on Arterial Oxygenation in the Microcirculation". Dr. Hart Schutz, University of Pennsylvania. Osler Hall. 5-6 p.m. (Toronto Neurological Society and Neuroscience Committee)

Geography

Prof. Paul Wheatley, Department of Geography, University of Chicago. 622 Sidney Smith Hall. 4 p.m. (SGS and Geography)

Music

John Dembeck, violin and Anne Drake Dembeck, piano. Concert Hall, 273 Bloor Street West. 12.15 p.m. Free. (Royal Conservatory of Music)

Classical Concert Series — Jennifer Dowden, flute. Music Room, Hart House. 1 p.m.

15 WEDNESDAY

Lecture
Education

"Stating your Assumptions and Presumptuousness". Robert Stake, author of *The Countenance of Evaluation*. OISE Auditorium. 8 p.m. Free.

Seminars
Wright Report

"Wright Report and Admissions Policy". Joel Saltzman. SAC office. 7.30 p.m. (SAC)

Education

With Robert Stake. 202 OISE. 10 a.m.

Music

ROM Jubilee Concerts — Joseph Macerollo, accordion. Fresco Gallery. 5.30 p.m. Free

16 THURSDAY

Lectures
Nietzsche

University College Series — "Nietzsche and After: Reflections on Echoes of Nietzsche's Thought in Literature". Prof. Hans Eichner. West Hall, U.C. 4.10 p.m. Coffee 3.30 p.m.

Dentistry

"Periodontal Disease". Prof. J. R. Trott, Department of Oral Pathology, University of Manitoba. Room 6, 4th floor, Toronto Professional Building. 2 to 5 p.m. (Dentistry)

Industrial Relations

"Interaction of Manpower and Educational Policies". Prof. Gerald G. Somers, University of Wisconsin. Coach House Conference Room, 150 St. George St. 4-6 p.m. (SGS and Industrial Relations)

Comp. Lit.

"Max Reinhardt and Molière". Dr. Leonhard Fiedler, University of Frankfurt. Upper Library, Massey College. 8 p.m. (SGS, Drama Centre and Graduate Department of German)

Social Neglect

"The Roots of Social Neglect in the United States". Prof. Robert Heilbroner, chairman, Economics department, New School for Social Research, New York. Medical Sciences auditorium. 8 p.m. (American Studies Committee and Associates of the University of Toronto Inc., New York)

Seminar
Transportation

"Continuum Approximation to Discrete Optimization". Prof. G. F. Newell, Institute of Transportation and Traffic Engineering, University of California at Berkeley. 116 Galbraith Building. 3.10 p.m. (Civil Engineering; Joint Program in Transportation, York — U of T)

Meeting

Joint meeting of University Arts Women's Club and U.C. Alumnae. "The University and Academia" with Dr. Robert Blackburn, Andrew S. Mathers, architect, and Miss M. E. Brown. John P. Robarts Research Library. 7.45 p.m. Husbands are invited.

Reception

To mark the opening day of exhibition of work by Hough, Stansbury and Associates Limited, landscape architects. Faculty of Architecture, 230 College St. 5-7 p.m.

Music

Classical Concert Series — Laura Mayne, soprano. Music Room, Hart House. 1 p.m.

"The Marriage of Figaro". Conductor, Ernesto Barbini. MacMillan Theatre, Edward Johnson Building. 8 p.m. Mar. 16-19 incl. All seats reserved. Tickets \$2.50, students \$1.50.

17 FRIDAY

Lectures
Dentistry

"Non-Stoichiometry of Apatites and the Effect of Fluoride-Ions on Their Solubility". Prof. Ferdinand C. M. Dreissens, Department of Science and Technology of Dental Materials, Faculty of Medicine, University of Nijmegen, The Netherlands. Room 6, 4th floor, Toronto Professional Building. 1.30 to 2.30 p.m. (Dentistry)

Engineering

"Soil Movements Associated with Excavation". Prof. Ralph B. Peck, Department of Civil Engineering, University of Illinois. 119 Galbraith Building. 3.10 p.m. (SGS and Civil Engineering)

Chemistry

Prof. N. J. Leonard, Department of Chemistry, University of Illinois. 158 Lash Miller Chemical Laboratories. 4 p.m. (SGS and Chemistry)

Seminars
Capitalism

"Capitalism: its Prospects". Prof. Robert Heilbroner. 2118 Sidney Smith Hall. 10 a.m.-12 noon. (American Studies Committee and Associates of the University of Toronto Inc., New York)

Computer

"Error Analysis in Matrix Calculations". Dr. J. H. Wilkinson, National Physical Laboratory, Teddington, Eng. 102 McLennan Physical Laboratories. 12 noon. (Computer Science)

18 SATURDAY

Festival

International Festival '72 — Arts and crafts; bazaar, films, folk dance music, discotheque, bar, Oketeke band. 2 p.m.-midnight. Free. International buffet, 5.30-7.30 p.m. \$1. International Student Centre, 33 St. George St.

Lecture

"Faces of Our Time". Yousuf Karsh. Convocation Hall. 8.15 p.m. Free. (Royal Canadian Institute)

19 SUNDAY

Music

Faculty of Music Woodwind Quintet. Program to include works by Hindemith, Reicha, Fein and Souris. Meeting Place. 3.30 to 4.30 p.m. (Scarborough College)

Films

"The Search for Ulysses", "The God Within". ROM Theatre. 2.30 p.m. Free.

20 MONDAY

Lectures
Comp. Lit.

"Philosophical, Poetic and Religious Speaking". Prof. Hans-Georg Gadamer, University of Heidelberg. Upper Library, Massey College. 8 p.m. (SGS, Comparative Literature, Graduate Philosophy, and Theology)

Michelangelo

"Understanding Michelangelo's Art Through his Poetry". Prof. Robert J. Clements, New York University. 2118 Sidney Smith Hall. 4.15 p.m. (SGS and Italian and Hispanic Languages and Literatures)

Music

"Music in Byzantium". Prof. Kenneth Levy, Princeton University. 116 Edward Johnson Building. 4 p.m. (Music and SGS)

Debate continues: more faculty views on Wright Report

Northrop Frye

In attempting to read the Draft Report of the Wright Commission, I found myself baffled so often by the prose of its "Aims and Objectives" section that I finally started reading it at the other end. There I discovered, on the last page, that for teaching in universities, one hour of "contact" with students would require two hours of "preparation", hence a teaching schedule of 13 hours a week would give one a 39-hour week. As this two hours of preparation is evidently intended to include marking and interviews as well, that leaves about one hour of preparation for each hour of lecturing.

For the information of the Commission, it takes eight to ten hours a week for every hour in the classroom, if that hour is to be of any conceivable use to students. A good deal of this time would be spent in what the Commission calls "research", and which it evidently regards as something different from working on one's teaching. I have never found, in over thirty years of teaching and writing, that I could separate the two activities. Students can read: what is the point of lecturing to them at all unless one has something to give them that they can't get, or easily get, in books?

I am aware that this point has, with a great many others, been dealt with in the U.T.F.A. brief. But it seemed to me to provide a central clue to the thinking, if that is the word, that underlies the Draft Report. Of course it is possible, in teaching such a subject as English literature, to pick out a good secondary source and memorize enough of it in an hour to get through another hour talking about it. That is sometimes done by overworked junior instructors or uninterested older ones, but if persisted in it becomes dishonest. But, of course, it is emphatically not "elitist": it would reduce all university teaching to the level of an eighteenth-century dame school. Consequently, it appears, it would fit very well into the "Aims and Objectives" of this Commission. It is a historic moment when a report on education concludes by taking an occasional abuse or corruption of the teaching practice in universities and proposes to make it the norm of procedure. That is why I think this casual footnote in the Report so crucial: if the Commission can get the central fact of university procedure so wrong, how can we believe or trust anything else it says?

NORTHROP FRYE
University Professor

F. C. Hooper

Although in commenting upon it one runs the risk of being called one of "those bull-shooters" from the University, the response given by the learned Commissioner Vincent Kelly to a studied comment upon the Draft Report ventured by the Faculty Association, the Report poses far too great a threat to the whole institution of the University to be ignored. To be sure it is a bewildering document, filled with internal contradictions and such a melange of social, pedagogical, economic and moral causes as to frustrate the analyst. But it boldly, if irrationally, reaches conclusions and makes recommendations of great import. However little the document itself commands respect, it comes from the highest level of the government where to-day's conclusions can be to-morrow's laws.

Although every area of university activity is threatened by the apparent insensitivity of the Commission to the essence of the university educational function, it seems to me that there is a particular threat to the professional faculties. This is perhaps most clearly illustrated by the Commission's hostility to the idea of elite groups existing within the educational system and its apparent determination to stamp these out. Engineering students are, or should be, just such a group.

Consider the nature of the engineering educational problems. We are necessarily concerned with basic truths, with understanding principles, with establishing competence in the execution of tasks which are often novel and complex, and with a continuing progress toward new achievements and new understandings.

These letters are contributions to the University's written debate on the exposure draft of the Wright Report — the Report of the Commission on Post-Secondary Education in Ontario. The Bulletin opened its columns to this subject at the request of the Faculty Association. Contributors should avoid personal references, strive for brevity, and follow the other rules for Letters to the Editor in the public press.

These are intellectually demanding activities. It is surely apparent that as a prerequisite to successful participation in such a program a student must have appropriate and developed aptitudes, including analytical abilities much above average.

Engineering students are therefore highly selected, both on entry and throughout their courses. They are competitive in their individual searches for excellence, and properly aspire to join that elite group made up of those with high achievements. The Commission does not appear to perceive that others cannot be legislated into this group, although they can of course be legislated into the institution where their presence could serve to dilute the quality of the programs and lower the standards of accomplishment. Not all engineers nor all universities, nor all commissions are worthy of equal esteem.

The Commission should recognize that engineering faculties in Ontario do not exist in isolation. They cannot be subjected to a closed boundary social experiment. Both intellectually and professionally professional engineers must function and compete in a worldwide arena, and no perverse action taken by the government of a province of Canada will dictate the global frame of reference. Staff and students are fortunately still free to move elsewhere, and many of the best would undoubtedly do so if the standards in Ontario were significantly reduced.

In its suggestions that entrance to the professions should preferably be made by examination after only part time study the Commission ignores completely the role of laboratories in developing and confirming competence, and of tutorials and other forms of direct staff-student relationship in the development of intellectual perspectives, of professional ethics and of personal commitments. This staff-student contact, together with continuous student-student interaction, characterizes the full time university experience and is unlikely to be compensated by vicarious contacts in print or on television, nor are the equivalents normally available in work experience. The universities have for centuries provided a uniquely favourable learning environment. It seems most unwise to plan to by-pass the campus as the normal road to professional qualification.

The Draft Report is perhaps even more ominous, although beyond clear interpretation, in its determination to centralize the control of programs of study. In an engineering faculty programs are in a continuous state of flux and development, in sensitive response to the changing technology, the shifting industrial economic background, and the current research activities in the discipline. There is no possibility that this free evolution could be adequately replaced by a centralized bureaucratic control.

There is a suspicion raised in the report that all the self-regulating professions are being lumped together and subjected to the same restrictions and controls in response to abuses that have existed only in certain areas. There have been no artificial "quotas" on registration in engineering schools, and the profession has been open through examination to qualified newcomers and to those diligent individuals who took the long road of private part time study. Engineers in Ontario have long forgone the personal advantages associated with restrictive entry to their profession. It is to be hoped that such responsible behaviour is recognized, and that the engineering profession will continue to be allowed full latitude in regulating itself.

In this respect particular objection needs to be taken to the suggestion that engineers should requalify every ten years by rewriting the initial qualifying examinations. This shows that the Commission is under the misapprehension that new graduates and experienced en-

gineers perform essentially the same functions, like dentists or druggists. This is not the case. The professional engineer, as he gains in experience and maturity moves on to duties of another class, leaving to the newly qualified the execution of many of the detailed techniques while he develops his broader appreciations and concepts.

If it is professional competence that concerns the Commission they should realize that engineers work in teams, or in close communication, and incompetence is readily detected and dealt with at the real level of activity.

F. C. HOOPER

Professor

Department of Mechanical Engineering

C. A. Ashley

Prof. Russell has drawn attention to the poor quality of the English in the Wright Commission Report. The following quotations reinforce his opinion. "By 1981, the proportion of male and female faculty at each level in universities in Ontario should at least equal the proportions of males and females receiving doctoral degrees in Canada in 1971". (p. 26) This is meaningless unless some neuters are employed. At least equal to must mean identical with, for if the proportion of one is higher, that of the other must be lower, and therefore less than equal. "If they [credits for work in universities and colleges] were equal the colleges of applied arts and technology would actually become junior colleges, a policy rejected by the Ontario government and concurred in by the Commission". (p. 20) The awkwardly worded explanation that follows suggests concurrence with the government: the opposite of what is stated in the quotation. "We assume that there should be a stronger correlation between teaching costs and total educational costs. This is not the case at present". (p. 43) How could it be?

This is an illiterate and slovenly report. For the educated members of the commission to sign it is "La trahison des clercs". The student member, who signed with reservations, is the only one who need not be ashamed. So much time and money for so shabby a document! Those who fear American influence will notice references to work in U.S.A., but to none in England. Even the University Grants Commission is ignored. The philosophy of the report is out of date even in U.S.A. — see the enlightened article by R. M. Huchins, "Permanence and Change", in the *Centre Magazine*.

C. A. ASHLEY

Professor Emeritus

Department of Political Economy

Gordon Nikiforuk

After perusal of the report the initial impulse of a small professional Faculty, such as ours, was to limit any remarks to that phase of the report of the Commission that is directly relevant to professional education. However, the draft report of the Commission touches on many important broad aspects of education about which we feel very strongly.

On the positive side the Faculty applauds the Commission for downgrading the significance of degrees, for proposals that ensure that wider segments of the population will receive and benefit from an education, for underscoring individuality and humaneness in learning, and for attempting to increase sensitivities of professions to public needs. On the negative side, the Faculty feels very strongly that the Commission showed a lack of sensitivity and understanding about the role of the university and how it relates to society, about those factors that make a university and the society it serves flourish and mature, and about the significance and inseparable nature of vital teaching and research; but above all, we feel that the Commission by proposing a rigid and cumbersome governmental bureaucratic control over post-second-

dary educational institutions has thereby created constraints that will not permit these institutions, their students and their staff to be what they are capable of becoming. Below we extend on the above summary remarks.

There are three general subjects that members of this Faculty would like to underscore.

1. The Role of the University

It is our opinion that the Commission did not effectively grapple with the singular role of the university as an innovator of ideas and as a critic of society; nor did the Commission attempt to understand the kind of climate that must be nourished in order to allow creative and unfettered thought within universities. The abstractions of academic freedom and excellence are not underscored by the Commission; instead, the university is cast in the same basic mold as any technical institute and is subject to the same administrative rigidities. This should not be so.

The two statements by the Commission on page 10 — "We also reject suggestions that the chief way to correct our social injustices and inequities is through the educational system" and "Because the socializing of citizens and their preparation for life and work in our society are the two essential functions of the educational system, it is an inescapable fact that education cannot get too far ahead of, nor too far behind, the society it serves" — suggest that universities must function within constraints that will not permit them to explore ideas too rapidly so that "they will not get out of touch with reality". Who is to make the decision as to whether the university is getting "too far ahead of" or "too far behind" or "out of touch with reality"? We suggest that no institution of higher learning can long remain vital with such constraints.

Further, the Faculty is of the opinion that universities in Ontario must not be developed as training grounds for job situations. Unless higher education is jealously guarded as a preparation for a way of life, and not for a way of making a living, we do not see anything but a further increase in competitions, degree-and-mark collections, and a conditioning of people to beat the system — in short, a mockery of the learning/teaching situation. Universities are for those who want to learn for the sake of learning, and not for those who learn in order to pass examinations and collect degrees by whatever means so as to assure themselves a preferential place in the job marketplace.

2. Teaching and Research

The Commission in Recommendation No. 61 recommends that public subsidy for institutional educational costs of post-secondary education should be divided into two categories — teaching and research. The clear and unmistakable relationship between vital teaching and research is denied by the above recommendation. Research adds perspective and is an integral part of an exciting teaching program. Curiosity-based research by staff members of universities remains as one of the most important catalysts for new ideas and new skills in teaching and related activities. The separation of these two activities, fiscally or otherwise, is arbitrary and is not in the interests of society. The exception to this might be applied, mission-oriented research which could be handled on a contractual basis.

3. Freedom and Education

The Commission, in several places in the report, pays lip service to the concept that the individual is paramount in the educational process and that the "principle of public accountability is not translated into uniform bureaucratic controls". Unfortunately subsequent recommendations do not effectively safeguard the above thinking. A rigid structure is proposed to implement programs. Rigid fiscal controls by the Department of Colleges and Universities virtually place faculty and staff in a straitjacket as far as the development of new programs is concerned. The concept of formula financing, whereby enrolment and financial

(See page 4, col. 1)

Debate continues: more faculty views on Wright Report

(Continued from page 3)

cial support are locked in, does not permit development of new programs without fighting agonizing bureaucratic hurdles. While the concept of public accountability is wise and should be encouraged, it should not be interpreted and extended to the point where staff and faculties have no jurisdiction to establish new programs or discontinue old ones. It is our opinion that the jurisdiction of the proposed Coordinating Board of Universities, as spelled out in the Commission report, sweeps academic freedom under the rug in the name of public accountability. In the long run the public are the losers.

Members of the Commission offered no alternatives to government programs and government control of the educational process. In considering develop-

ment of institutions of post-secondary education some encouragement and incentive should be provided for the private sector of society.

Adlai Stevenson once said, "In the

long run the right thing is also the politically correct thing to do". In the case of the Wright report we must conclude that this guideline was not always apparent. It would appear that the politics of edu-

cation is too important to be left solely in the hands of politicians.

GORDON NIKIFORUK
Dean
Faculty of Dentistry

Charles Eames lecture and film presentation

The Alumni Association of the Faculty of Architecture, Urban and Regional Planning, and Landscape Architecture, U of T, has arranged to fly the industrial and interior designer Charles Eames, and a multi-media presentation, to Toronto to appear at the Cinesphere, Ontario Place, on March 20 at 8 p.m.

For further information on the lecture and film presentation, phone R. Dolan, Alumni House, U of T, 928-2369. Reservations taken at 928-8991 - \$3 in advance or \$5 at the door. Cash bar at Ontario Place, 7.30 to 8 p.m. and 9.30 to 11 p.m.

Chairman is sought for Dept of German

A Search Committee has been set up by the Acting President to find and recommend a successor to Prof. H. N. Milnes, chairman of the Department of German in University College, who will have completed his five-year term on June 30. The members of the Committee are as follows:

Principal of University College (chairman)

Dean of the School of Graduate Studies (or his representative) (Dean J. H. Parker)

Prof. H. Eichner (German)

Prof. W. A. Goffart (Medieval Studies, History)

Prof. D. Myers (German)

Prof. P. R. Robert (French)

Prof. M. J. Sinden (German)

Suggestions or comments may be made to any member of the Committee or to its chairman.

More accommodation for rent and wanted

Sublet unfurnished 2-bedroom apartment, Bloor and Bedford; \$235 a month, available now; will accommodate four. Telephone 928-2200 or 929-5602 evenings.

Wanted to rent on or before June 1, 1972, 3-bedroom house or larger, with garden, preferably Rosedale or Moore Park area, for 15-16 months, by professor, with wife and 3-year-old son, who is taking up a new appointment at U of T. Contact Miss Grace Vallis, 928-2380.

Furnished house for rent, July 1-Aug. 15. \$300. 15 minutes' walk from St. George campus. Washer and dryer, garage, etc. 928-3611 or 922-8060.

Furnished 3-bedroom family home pleasantly situated facing park in North Toronto within city limits; own heated swimming pool. From June 1972 to August 1973. \$300 per month. Phone 481-0615.

Large detached four-bedroom, plus study, house, fully furnished, utilities room, etc.; small yard ideal for children; close to shops, TTC and schools; ravine park and beach on Lake Ontario. Available Sept. 1, 1972 to August, 1973. Effective rent \$235 monthly. Telephone 694-4475.



Dr. Bernard Etkin

Dr. Boris Stoicheff

Dr. Ian Rowe

Dr Boris Stoicheff of Physics succeeds Dr Etkin as head of the Division of Engineering Science

Dr. Boris Stoicheff, a professor in the Department of Physics and leader of a new group working in the laser field, is to succeed Dr. Bernard Etkin as head of the Division of Engineering Science of the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering. He will devote approximately half time to these new responsibilities. Dr. Ian Rowe, a professor of Electrical Engineering, will continue as associate chairman of the Division.

Dr. James Ham, dean of the Faculty of Applied Science and Engineering, in making the announcement, points out that although the appointment of a chairman from a different faculty will appear to many persons to be an interesting precedent, there is nothing extraordinary about it in the special case of Engineering Science. The Division under the title of Engineering Physics owes its origin to the initiative in 1934 of two eminent professors of Physics, Dr. Lachlan Gilchrist and Dr. E. F. Burton and of Dean C. R. Young of Engineering. In 1962 the name of the Division was changed to Engineering Science.

In its first year, 12 students enrolled, of whom six graduated. The popularity of the program subsequently grew as it became better known, and as its graduates proved their worth. In 1958-59 the total enrolment in all four years reached a peak of 399. Last year, the total enrolment was 347.

From the beginning, students were offered a choice of several options in which they could specialize in the two final years. They have varied over the years and are currently Aerospace Science, Chemical, Computer Science, Electrical, Geophysics, Materials Science, Nuclear and Thermal Power and Physics. More recently, additional flexibility has been introduced, so that students may take a variety of technical electives, or even depart altogether from the planned options.

Dr. Stoicheff himself graduated from the course in 1947, exercising the option to specialize in Physics. He then went on to gain his M.A. and Ph.D. in Physics at the U of T.

Dr. Stoicheff's interests include spectroscopy, light, molecular structure and lasers and their applications to Physics. He has six graduate students and two post-doctoral fellows in his research laboratory and he teaches third and fourth year Physics. He is author or co-author of some 70 scientific papers. He is a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada, of the Optical Society of America and of the American Physical Society, an Honorary Member of the Indian Academy of Sciences and a Member of the Canadian Association of Physicists. In 1967, he was awarded the Centennial Medal of Canada.

Among other activities, he is a member of the National Research Council of Canada Physics Grants Selection Committee, and Chairman of the NRC Physics Selection Committee and of the NRC High Energy Sub-Committee. He is a Director-at-Large of the Optical Society of America and a Member of the Joint Council of Quantum Electronics.

Of the Engineering Science Course, Dr. Stoicheff says: "It's a great course and its strength is in the fact that it is a very flexible but yet a very thorough program of training in the basic sciences and their applications. A young man who takes such a course is in a very critical position to contribute new ideas." He believes strongly in the principle of taking a highly selected group and offering them intensive specialized training, and believes the same technique could be usefully applied in other faculties.

Students wishing to enter Engineering Science must secure the equivalent of 75 per cent in Grade 13 but the average mark obtained is much higher - around 85 per cent. However, Professor Etkin and Professor Rowe are quick to stress that the program is not an "honours course". It is intended to be different

from, not better than, programs offered by various departments to other engineering students.

"The motivation for being in Engineering Science is different from that of the other Engineering departments", Rowe points out. "The others are interested in being closer to hardware, closer to synthesis that uses established techniques. Instead, the Engineering Science students tend to be more analytically oriented. And, if you look at the role they play when they graduate, you find that they are complementary to the others".

In fact, as Dr. Etkin points out, Engineering Science is a program that frankly and explicitly dedicates itself to preparing students for research and development and the educational field. As a result, two-thirds of Engineering Science students go on to Graduate School and secure doctorates or masters' degrees, a percentage that is about twice that of the rest of Engineering graduates.

In spite of the heavy bias on mathematics and science in the course, it is interesting to note that Engineering Science maintains a distinctive emphasis in engineering and in applied science. A recent ten-year study showed that more Engineering Science graduates remain in engineering and in applied science than do their counterparts in the other engineering fields, who often tend to move into management operations and sales positions. The study further showed that of more than half who responded to a questionnaire about their current activity, 13 per cent were employed by governments, 46 per cent by industry and 34 per cent in educational institutions. In spite of the great efflux of senior engineers in the aviation industry that followed the discontinuation of the Arrow interceptor program in the late 1950's, it is interesting to note that 82 per cent of Engineering Science graduates were still employed in Canada, with almost all the remainder being in the U.S.A.